

## **EXHIBIT A**

**From:** [Arjun Vasan](#)  
**To:** [Makitalo, Rebecca I.](#)  
**Cc:** [Keech, Ryan Q.](#); [Chiu, Stacey G.](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Vasan v. Checkmate - Case No. 2:25-CV-00765-MEMF-JPR; Request to Meet and Confer regarding Deficient Initial Disclosures [KLG-AMERICAS.FID3718879]  
**Date:** Saturday, August 30, 2025 7:05:48 AM

---

**This Message Is From an External Sender**

This message came from outside your organization.

Ms. Makitalo,

At the Rule 26(f) conference, I stated that discovery should not proceed on Checkmate's counterclaims until the pleadings are settled. The Joint Report memorializes that position in my proposed discovery section. That was intended—and serves—as my Rule 26(a)(1)(C) objection to providing initial disclosures on counterclaim topics before the Court sets phasing.

Consistent with that objection, I will serve Phase-I-only initial disclosures by the current deadline and will supplement under Rule 26(e) within 14 days if the Court later permits and accepts any amended counterclaim. To the extent there is any ambiguity, I renew and clarify the 26(a)(1)(C) objection here.

Rule 26(a)(1)(C) clearly states that the court must rule first if a party objects to initial disclosures. I once again reiterate my availability on September 4th after the hearing for an in person meet and confer, and on the 5th through 8th as I have previously stated.

I further note your failure to timely oppose my motions to dismiss Checkmate's counterclaims and to strike its affirmative defenses. I gather you will seek leave to file a late opposition, or file a notice of non-opposition shortly.

Best regards,

Arjun Vasan